DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 7/13/2011 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

2.   With regard to claim 1, Applicant again argues that Cattan and Arneson fail to

disclose "storing message state information at the computer system that is unique to a

message to be sent to a device" (Remarks 2-4). While this argument has been

reconsidered, it remains unpersuasive for the reasons set forth in the Office action of

4/13/2011 (Office action of 4/13/2011, §2).

Specifically, the combined disclosure of Catan and Arneson would have taught

and/or suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art that use of a message identifier would

have advantageously allowed reply messages with identical content to be differentiated

and associated with original messages quickly and easily. This would have allowed the

appropriate action to be performed based on the user selection in the reply message

and also advantageously allowed multiple sessions with a single mobile device.

3.   With further regard to claim 1, and Applicant's assertion that "there is no teaching

or suggestion in Arneson to use the claim check to obtain information as in FIG. 3 of

Arneson other than mobile directory numbers, message summaries, or the original

messages" (Remarks 3), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. In fact, Arneson explicitly

states that "[t]hose of ordinary skill n the art will realize that a claim check may point to

and identify information other than the MDN, message summary, and event message"

(¶55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cattan

et al. (US 6,961,330) in view of Arneson et al. (US 2001/0056508).

6.   With regard to claim 1, Cattan discloses a method for messaging with devices in

order to perform one or more actions, the method comprising:

storing action information at a computer system (Cellular-to-Web Converter 140)

that acts as an intermediary for devices (mobile terminal 110) to access a set of one or

more applications (application server 150/170) to perform the one or more actions

action information is stored in a session resolution table at the computer system)(col. 9,

ll. 46-50), the stored action information providing an action identifier (fig. 8; possible

Responsive SMS Messages) identifying each action in the one or more actions and a

mapping between the action identifier and information specifying how the computer

system interacts with at least one application in the set of one or more applications to

perform the action corresponding to the action identifier (possible actions are correlated with particular active server pages that are used to perform the actions and generate responses)(col. 8, l. 61 to col. 9, l. 5; col. 15, ll. 30-36; figs. 5 and 8);

storing message state information at the computer system that is associated with a message to be sent to a device (fig. 8), the message state information providing a message identifier automatically generated by the computer system to identify the message to be sent to a device (ID of the mobile terminal to which the message was sent and the SMS destination address of the application from which the message originated are stored in the session resolution table)(col. 15, ll. 24-30) and a mapping between the message identifier generated by the computer system and the stored action information (the ID of the mobile terminal and the SMS destination address are mapped to a particular active server page URI)(col. 15, ll. 24-30; col. 16, ll. 7-10);

sending the message to a device using the computer system, the message sent to the device including one or more action identifiers corresponding to actions represented in the message (SMS message containing a list of the action identifiers is sent to the mobile terminal)(col. 15, ll. 45-52);

receiving a response message from the device at the computer system, the response message including at least one of the one or more action identifiers for the actions represented in the message sent to the device (response message includes a selection of one of the action identifiers)(col. 15, ll. 58-67);

retrieving the stored message state information associated with the message sent to the device using the computer system to obtain the mapping between the

message identifier and the stored action information based on the message identifier

received in the response message from the device (appropriate action information is

obtained using the mapping between the ID and the SMS destination address and the

URI associated with the appropriate action)(col. 16, ll. 1-14);

retrieving action information corresponding to an action in the one or more

actions using the computer system from the stored action information based on the at

least one of the one or more action identifiers for the actions represented in the

message sent to the device and the mapping between the message identifier and the

stored action information (stored action information is retrieved and output to the HHTP

request manager)(col. 16, ll. 1-14); and

performing the action using the retrieved action information (the selected

command is executed to obtain a response)(col. 16, ll. 14-45).

Cattan fails to specifically disclose that the message identifier uniquely identifies

a particular message or that the message identifier is included in the message sent to

the device and received in the reply from the device.

Arneson discloses a similar system for transmitting messages between a mobile

device and a notification server (¶8). Arneson teaches assigning a unique identifier

(claim check) to each message (¶53). Arneson also teaches including the identifier in

the message sent to the mobile device (¶52; ¶83) and in the reply received from the

mobile device (¶85). This would have been an advantageous addition to the system

discloses by Cattan since it would have allowed reply messages received from the

mobile devices to be associated with a particular message sent to the mobile device,

allowing the system to quickly and accurately identify the appropriate actions to take based on the response by referencing the session table using the unique message identifier.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a message identifier that uniquely identifies a message sent to a mobile device, since it would have allowed reply messages to be quickly and accurately associated with original messages to determine the appropriate actions to take in response to the reply message.

7.   With regard to claims 2 and 25, Cattan further discloses that the action information comprises information compatible with a web-based application, wherein the web-based application is used to perform the action (commands may be used to get information from a web server)(col. 16, ll. 14-20).

8.   With regard to claim 3, 23 and 24, Cattan further discloses that the sent message comprises a text-based message and the response message comprises a text-based message (messages sent to/from the mobile device are SMS messages)(col. 15, ll. 45-67).

9.   With regard to claims 4 and 14, Cattan further discloses sending a result of the performed action to the device (information retrieved by the server is returned to the device)(col. 16, ll. 34-45).

10.   With regard to claims 5, 6, 13, 19 and 20, Arneson further discloses determining,

from a response message, information specific to the device (identifier of calling device)

and information specific to a user associated with the device (claim check) (¶53). This

information is used to retrieve stored event information from a database (¶53; ¶60).

11.   With regard to claims 7 and 22, Cattan further discloses that sending the

message to the device comprises sending the message to a mobile device (mobile

terminal)(col. 15, ll. 45-47).

12.   Claims 8, 15 and 21 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1, since they

recite substantially identical subject matter. Any differences between the claims do not

result in patentably distinct claims and all of the limitations are taught by the above cited

art.

13.   With regard to claims 9, 10 and 18, Cattan further discloses that the second

information that enables the one or more actions to be performed comprises state

information for a web-based application, particularly a URL (col. 15, ll. 24-30; col. 16, ll.

1-30).

14.   With regard to claims 11, 12, 16 and 17, Cattan further discloses that the sent

message and the text message each comprise a plain-text message (both messages

are SMS text messages)(col. 15, ll. 45-67).

Conclusion

15.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to AARON STRANGE whose telephone number is

(571)272-3959. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on 571-272-6703. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aaron Strange/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2448